



**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**  
THE DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT COMMAND  
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD, SUITE 2533  
FT. BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

IN REPLY  
REFER TO

AQOG

**JUN 10 1996**

**MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDERS, DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT  
DISTRICTS**

**SUBJECT: Revised Delivery Forecast (RDF) Issues**

DCMC Policy letter 96-4, dated April 1, 1996, directed DCMC organizations to cease using the MOCAS RDF process to communicate delivery status to our customers. Inherent in that direction was a recognition that the RDF coverage metric in the Executive Information System would not be available since no RDF data would be input to MOCAS. Questions and misunderstanding within DCMC Districts about the value of continuing to input RDF data into MOCAS and what constitutes performance data prompt this clarification.

Misunderstandings about the loss of MOCAS RDF data have led some to characterize it as a loss of contractor performance information. This is not true. Our surveillance actions, properly executed, should be reporting "anticipated" delays. Information reported to the customer as an anticipated delay cannot be included in the past performance data for a contractor. There can be no insinuation of poor performance unless a contractual requirement has actually been breached. The breach is actual delinquency, @ anticipated delinquency.

Nothing in the change of status reporting methods should be construed to diminish the importance of MOCAS. I want to stress that complete and accurate performance data in MOCAS is crucial to the success of contract administration. To assure the completeness of our performance data on completed contracts, we are in process of issuing a policy letter that requires the completion of the contract history file screen, UNKP 10, before a contract can be moved from Section 2 to Section 5 of MOCAS.

Some have expressed concerns that lack of MOCAS RDF data will result in the loss of management visibility of surveillance coverage. I would point out that those CAOS with ALERTS installed have a ready means of assessing the health of their efforts. For those where ALERTS has not yet been installed, a temporary process of annotating production folders, supervisory visits and customer feedback will give you points to assess until your surveillance records are automated through ALERTS.

To reiterate the intent of DCMC Policy Letter 96-4, we do not intend to use the MOCAS RDF process for either routable or non-routable RDFs, or for any other purpose. We must use other more effective means to communicate with our customers and we will not invest additional resources in duplicate reporting of the same information in MOCAS.

If there are any **further** questions concerning this policy, they **may be** directed to Mr. Wayne E. Easter, Product and Manufacturing Assurance Team at (703) 767-3360 or DSN 427-3360.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jill E. Pettibone". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Jill" being more prominent.

JILL E. PETTIBONE

Executive Director

Contract Management Policy